

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,945	10/06/2006	Laurent Caron	FR-AM 2024 NP	5453
31684 7590 69/12/2008 ARKEMA INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT - 26TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			MC GINTY, DOUGLAS J	
2000 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3222			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/593,945	CARON, LAURENT	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DOUGLAS MC GINTY	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply

	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rapty be timely filled after 50 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The communication of the communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for may will by statistic, cause the application to become ABANDADED (55 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any
St	atus
	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on
	2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
)i	sposition of Claims
	4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
۱ŗ	pplication Papers
	9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
r	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	a)
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. __
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: ___

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-6-06 & 9-22-06.

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 should have either 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane (236fa) or 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane (227ea). See CAS reg. nos. 690-39-1 and 431-89-0 included with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1796

 Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bogdan (US 2003/0050356).

Bogdan teaches a composition containing 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluorobutane (365mfc), trans-1,2-dichloroethylene, and 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropropane (245fa), with amounts overlapping or touching the ranges presently claimed [0014-0016]. The composition may be used as an expanding agent, i.e., foaming agent, for polyol-containing compositions [0029], solvent and aerosol [0018], and cooling agent, i.e., refrigerant [0021].

Bogdan teaches that the upper limit for the non-HFC component, i.e., trans-1,2-dichloroethylene, is "about 23 wt" [0015]. The "about 23 wt%" limitation is an approximate value which touches on the lower limits of 24 and 25 wt% presently claimed. See Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Caraco Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Ltd., 476 F.3d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

With respect to claim 4 which requires a minimum of 65 wt% for trans-1,2-dichloroethylene, Bogdan teaches that an upper limit for that compound is "preferably ... about 23 wt%" [0015]. A preferred amount does not negate the broader teachings of the reference, however, which indicate that 50 wt% or more of the trans compound is still non-flammable [0014].

Based on the foregoing, Bogdan is found to anticipate the present claims.

The presently claimed invention also would have been obvious over the

Art Unit: 1796

teachings of Bogdan because that reference teaches compositions of 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluorobutane (365mfc), trans-1,2-dichloroethylene, and 1,1,1,3,3-pentafluoropropane (245fa) which may be used as an expanding agent, i.e., foaming agent, for polyol-containing compositions, solvent and aerosol, and cooling agent, i.e., refrigerant.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 2003/0050356) as applied to claims 1-4 and 6-9 above, and further in view of Bowman (US 2007/0010592).

To the extent claim 5 is understood, Bogdan does not appear to teach the addition of either 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane (236fa) or 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane (227ea).

Nevertheless, Bowman teaches the addition of 1,1,1,3,3,3hexafluoropropane (236fa) and/or 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane (227ea) to blowing compositions containing a wide variety other compounds, including those presently claimed [0049, 0055, 0056]. Other uses include cooling agents, i.e., refrigerants [0002].

It would have been obvious to incorporate the 1,1,1,3,3,3hexafluoropropane (236fa) and/or 1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane (227ea)
taught by Bowman in the compositions taught by Bogman because both
references teach mixtures used as blowing and cooling agents. "The
combination of familiar [components] according to known methods is likely to be
obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." KSR Intem. Co. v.
Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1739 (2007). Obviousness only requires a

Art Unit: 1796

reasonable expectation of success. *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894, 904 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Secondary Considerations

The examples at p. 7 of the present application have been carefully reviewed. However, the evidence of unexpectedly better results, e.g., flashpoints, is not considered to be commensurate with the scope of the presently claimed invention. MPEP 716.02(d).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS MC GINTY whose telephone number is (571)272-1029. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 830-500.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,945 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DOUGLAS MC GINTY/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

**